



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/736,641

12/17/2003

Don T. Cameron

20003.0075

3833

79175

7590

04/30/2010

HANIFY & KING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW

Suite 400

WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/30/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/736,641	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CAMERON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gabrielle McCormick	<b>Art Unit</b> 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11-13,15-19,21-27,30 and 32-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11-13,15-19,21-27,30 and 32-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. This action is in reply to the amendment filed on March 15, 2010.
2. Claims 1, 3-8, 11-13, 15-19, 21-27 and 30 have been amended.
3. Claims 32-34 have been added.
4. Claims 2, 14, 20, 29 and 31 have been canceled.
5. Claims 1, 3-8, 11-13, 15-19, 21-27, 30 and 32-34 are currently pending and have been examined.

### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claim 21 is objected to for being dependent from a canceled claim. For purposes of examination, the Examiner will understand the claim to depend from claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
8. Claims 1, 3-8, 11-13, 15-19, 21-27, 30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
9. Claim 1 recites "providing a *link that is accessible via a webpage* to indicate the status of examination". Claim 30 recites providing "*a link that is accessible via a webpage* to indicate the commencement of an examination".
10. The specification on page 10, beginning at line 9, states:

Art Unit: 3629

...the website will generate a **control number** that is associated with the owner's order. This number is preferably placed on the mailing label and/or packing slip so that the authenticator can easily associate the product with the owner and associated information. The owner can use this number to obtain the current status of his order, such as through the authentication website. For example, by accessing the authentication website and entering the control number in the appropriate place, the owner will first be able to determine when the product has been received by the authenticator. After the authenticator has determined that the correct product has been shipped and matched to an order, the product will be placed in a queue to be examined. As an initial step of the examination process, the website will be updated to indicate that the examination has begun or is in process. Upon completion of the examination, the website will again be updated to indicate the examination is complete. Additionally, the website will provide the results of the examination.

11. Thus, the specification discloses that it is a **number, not a link accessible via a webpage**, that the user inputs into a website is used to access the status information.
12. Claim 27 recites that an *encoded text link...that provides the **examination status** and report* is provided.
13. The specification on page 11, beginning at line 12 states, "providing an encoded text or registry engine code that a product owner can paste into an auction website listing. The text is hyperlinked directly to a page within the authentication website that **provides the examination results** for the product being sold."
14. Thus, the specification does not provide support for the encoded text link providing examination status.
15. Applicant's amendments to claims 1 and 30 have overcome the previous rejection under 112, first paragraph.
16. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
17. Claims 21 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3629

18. Claim 21 appears to reiterate information recited in claim 1. Claim 21 recites "an indication of how the equipment has been altered". Claim 1 recites that the report comprises assigning a third result comprising an alteration condition. It is unclear how the limitation of claim 21 differs from claim 1.
19. Claims 24-27 contain phrases that lack proper antecedent basis. The phrases, "the step of creating" and "the step of providing an encoded test link" lack proper antecedent basis as a result of the amendments to claim 23 and claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. **Claims 1, 3-8, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, 23-27 and 32-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solheim (US Pub. No. 2002/0077956) in view of Knowles et al (US Pat. No. 6,182,897, hereinafter referred to as "Knowles"), in view of Callaway (pages documented from the Internet Archive from November 29, 2002 at <http://web.archive.org/web/20011020005809/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/trade-rules.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20020601221544/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/guarantee.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20021203111831/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/c016871c.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20020601224341/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/condition.html>), in view of Mehren ("Letters by Duchess of Windsor, Prince to Be Published; [Home Edition]". Los Angeles Times (pre-1997 Fulltext). Los Angeles, Calif.: Apr 26, 1986, pg. 6).
22. **Claims 1, 21, 27 and 32-34:** Solheim discloses
- *receiving golf equipment to be authenticated* (P[0020]);

Art Unit: 3629

- *identifying relevant features of the equipment; comparing the features to predetermined manufacturing specification and determining whether the features conform to the manufacturing specifications.* (P[0020]: golf equipment is received by manufacturer for inspection of the items to verify authenticity and P[0016]: during bidding, manufacturer sends "factory original specifications" to the bidder so that the bidder can also determine "whether any radical changes have been made to the clubs". Thus, it is implicit that during the manufacturer's verification of authenticity, the manufacturer would also compare the equipment to the factory specifications to determine conformity.)
  - *assigning a unique registration number to the equipment each time it is provided for authentication* (P[0017]: a reference to the auction item number (i.e., a unique registration number) with detailed information regarding requested services (i.e., a request for authentication) and the identity of the bidder is stored on the manufacturer's system.
23. Solheim does not disclose providing a link that is accessible via a website to indicate the status of examination.
24. Knowles, however, discloses enabling a customer to track the progress of ordered equipment during various phases of manufacture using the manufacturer's website. (Fig. 3; E).
25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included tracking the status, as disclosed by Knowles in the system disclosed by Solheim, for the motivation of providing a method of informing the customer about the progress of his item during the authentication process.
26. Solheim does not disclose inputting examination parameters into a computer operable to prepare a report of the examination comprising results or providing a link to access the report.
27. Callaway, however, discloses that clubs are received and certified. The reports are accessed via a webpage and contain various results that include a unique number (SKU #), Condition information, information that indicates an original condition (Lie Angle: Standard). (pages 4-5). Details regarding the conditions are disclosed on page 6.

Art Unit: 3629

28. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included result information as a web accessible report, as disclosed by Callaway, in the system of Solheim for the motivation of providing information regarding the authentication process in a manner that is easily accessible to the bidder. Solheim discloses uses web forms for the bidder to use to request the services. It is obvious for Solheim to be expanded to provide report information to the bidder in a web-based manner as well.
29. Solheim discloses verifying authenticity, but does not disclose a report. Callaway discloses a report, but does not disclose a result of fake or authentic.
30. Mehren, however, discloses an authentication process where a report indicates a forgery (thus a fake). (pg. 1; para. 11).
31. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a report that indicates a fake, as disclosed by Mehren, in the system of Solheim for the motivation of alerting the bidder that the equipment is not authentic so that the bidder can determine actions to take with the seller.
32. Solheim discloses that the bidder receives factory specification so that he can determine whether "any radical changes have been made to the clubs, such as reshafting with an incorrect type of shaft." (P[0016]). Solheim does not disclose a report, therefore does not disclose the alteration information and condition would be reported as part of the authentication performed at P[0020]).
33. However, it is obvious that this information would be discovered during the verification process, and when combined with either Callaway or Mehren (who both disclose reports) would be reported back to the bidder.
34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included reporting alteration conditions, in the system of Solheim for the motivation of informing the bidder of all conditions of the equipment as received. It is obvious to do so in the event that the bidder would request servicing or repair of the equipment.
35. The Examiner contends that the results of "fake" and "original" are **nonfunctional descriptive data** and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. **The reporting of the examination**

Art Unit: 3629

**would be performed regardless of results.** Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

36. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included “original” and “fake” because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of report information does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

37. The Examiner contends that alteration indications and product condition result information are **nonfunctional descriptive data** and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. **The reporting of the examination would be performed regardless of results.** Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

38. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included various alteration indications such as grip replaced and shaft replaced and condition results such as mint, good fair, etc. because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of report information does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

39. **Claims 3-8, 13, 15 and 19:** Solheim discloses inspecting the equipment using factory specifications, but does not provide elaboration of the inspection process.

40. Callaway, however, on pages 4 and 5, discloses features of a certified preowned club, including physical dimensions (loft), materials (graphite), manufacturer markings (“Callaway” in the photo), shape (driver), stamping (see bottom of club in photo), shaft (Callaway BBUL Graphite) and condition (fair). Callaway provides definitions for grading the condition of preowned clubs based on the number of rounds of golf played. (pg. 6). Callaway receives the club and performs a “meticulous inspection” as part of the certification process. (pg. 3). Though Callaway does not



Art Unit: 3629

disclose a first or second view, it is inherent that the club is viewed numerous times and from numerous angles during the inspection. Callaway also discloses an authentication certificate. (page 3).

41. Callaway does not disclose the *finish, paint fill grip or weight*.
42. However, these differences are only found in the **nonfunctional descriptive data** and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. **The identification of relevant features would be performed regardless of specific features such as finish, paint fill, grip and weight.** Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).
43. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included finish, paint fill, grip and weight because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of relevant features does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention. It is obvious that in Callaway's disclosure of additional features such as gender, lie angle, hand and flex that the relevant features that Callaway deems necessary to aiding in the sale of certified preowned clubs is provided and that should additional information be necessary, Callaway would be capable of providing it.
44. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included examination details, as disclosed by Callaway, in the system of Solheim for the motivation of ensuring a thorough inspection has been performed. It is obvious that Solheim would perform such an inspection during the verification.
45. **Claims 16 and 18:** Solheim and Callaway are combined, above. Callaway further discloses a "Certified Preowned title" (pg. 3). The word "Callaway" on the pictured "Certificate of Authenticity" is a seal. It cannot be determined whether "Callaway" is embossed. Further, a picture or a reference number is not disclosed with the Certificate, however, on page 4, a photo and a SKU # are provided for a club offered for sale as a certified preowned club.

Art Unit: 3629

46. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the photo and SKU with the certificate for the motivation of providing increased assurance to the purchaser of the club that the club is traceable to the certificate. It is old and well known to provide details linking a physical product to a document that certifies its characteristics for quality assurance and traceability purposes. Embossing the word "Callaway" would be an obvious addition to the certificate as a means of preventing forged copies of the certificate.
47. **Claim 23-26:** Solheim discloses an in-transit process where the golf equipment is mailed to the manufacturer for authentication. A request form is filled out by the bidder to inputting specific services (thus the authenticator is informed) (P[0018]); the shipping information is automatically sent to the seller (P[0020]).
48. Solheim does not disclose a packing slip, however, the Examiner takes **Official Notice** that packing slips are old and well known.
49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a packing slip, in the system of Solheim for the motivation of ensuring that the request for services match the items mailed to the manufacturer.
50. **Claims 11, 12 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solheim (US Pub. No. 2002/0077956) in view of Knowles et al (US Pat. No. 6,182,897, hereinafter referred to as "Knowles"), in view of Callaway (pages documented from the Internet Archive from November 29, 2002 at <http://web.archive.org/web/20011020005809/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/trade-rules.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20020601221544/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/guarantee.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20021203111831/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/c016871c.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20020601224341/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/condition.html>), in view of Mehren ("Letters by Duchess of Windsor, Prince to Be Published; [Home Edition]"). Los

Art Unit: 3629

Angeles Times (pre-1997 Fulltext). Los Angeles, Calif.: Apr 26, 1986, pg. 6) in further view of Chester (US Pub. No. 2004/0054888).

**51. Claims 11 and 12:** Solheim does not disclose *comparing the equipment to a previously prepared record of the equipment*.

**52.** Chester, however, discloses “verifying the authenticity and ownership of a registered item or article by querying the accrediting authority”, transferring an item, issuing a new certification of authenticity to new purchaser and registering the transferred item or article and new owner. (P[0016]). During verification and title transfer, the correct owner and “a static digital image” (i.e., picture) is provided. (P[0032]). Thus, Chester provides access to a previous record and a picture.

**53.** Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included comparison to previous records and pictures, as disclosed by Chester, in the system of Solheim for the motivation of verifying ownership at the authentication. Solheim would be motivated to access previous records and photos to ensure that a club received had not been stolen from a registered owner. It is old and well known that companies track the ownership of products sold for various purposes, including offering new product promotions.

**54. Claim 17:** Solheim/Callaway does not disclose *providing said reference number on the equipment*.

**55.** Chester, however, discloses a “hologram with embedded attributes with encrypted protection and password or personal identification number...for use with each separate item or article to be authenticated by each authorized distributor...” (P[0029]).

**51.** Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included indicia and reference number on an authenticated item, as disclosed by Chester, in the system of Callaway for the motivation of linking the item to a certificate of authentication.

**56. Claim 22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solheim (US Pub. No. 2002/0077956) in view of Knowles et al (US Pat. No. 6,182,897, hereinafter referred to as “Knowles”), in view of Callaway (pages documented from the Internet Archive from November 29,

2002 at <http://web.archive.org/web/20011020005809/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/trade-rules.html>;

<http://web.archive.org/web/20020601221544/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/guarantee.html>;

<http://web.archive.org/web/20021203111831/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/c016871c.html>;

<http://web.archive.org/web/20020601224341/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/condition.html>), in view of Mehren ("Letters by Duchess of Windsor, Prince to Be Published; [Home Edition]". Los Angeles Times (pre-1997 Fulltext). Los Angeles, Calif.: Apr 26, 1986, pg. 6) in further view of Harreld ("Scrutinizing the numbers". InfoWorld. San Mateo: Aug. 19, 2002. Vol 24, Iss. 33; pg. 35).

57. **Claim 22:** Solheim/Callaway does not disclose a color-coded certificate based on results.
58. Harreld, however, discloses the executive receive color-coded reports highlighting any variances from performance goals. (pg. 2; para. 12).
59. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included color coding certificates based on results, as disclosed by Harreld, in the system of Callaway for the motivation of providing a visual alert. For example, if a club was listed as Condition: Very Good, color-coding would provide a visual clue that would direct potential buyers to that listing and therefore increase the likelihood of selling the club.
60. **Claim 30** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaway (pages documented from the Internet Archive from November 29, 2002 at <http://web.archive.org/web/20011020005809/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/trade-rules.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20020601221544/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/guarantee.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20021203111831/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/c016871c.html>; <http://web.archive.org/web/20020601224341/www.callawaygolfpreowned.com/condition.html>) in view of Solheim (US Pub. No. 2002/0077956) in view of Knowles et al (US Pat. No. 6,182,897, hereinafter referred to as "Knowles") in view of Bernard (US Pub. No. 2003/0171927).

Art Unit: 3629

61. **Claims 30:** Callaway discloses a method where used Callaway golf clubs can be traded in for either new or previously owned clubs. The method involves mailing the club for trade to Callaway (pg. 1; III), verifying the club (pg. 1; VI) and returning an unacceptable club (pg. 2; bullets 5&6: thus the golf equipment is returned from the second entity to the first entity). Clubs that are accepted are given a "Certified Preowned title" (i.e., results are reported) after passing a "meticulous inspection." Callaway provides a SKU # (i.e., a unique registration number -pg. 4). It is obvious that as the manufacturer of the preowned clubs, Callaway would have access to manufacturing specifications and would therefore determine whether the features of the traded clubs conform to the manufacturing specifications. It is inherent that as the manufacturer, Callaway is an authorized authenticator. Callaway reports the results (pg. 4-5) on a web page.
62. Callaway discloses *assigning unique registration numbers to the golf equipment each time it is provided for authentication.*
63. Callaway further discloses a link that is accessible via a webpage to access the results. (pg. 4-5 contain the results via a link ("Great Big Bertha Driver").)
64. Callaway discloses that results are grouped into at least *three categories*. (pg. 6 discloses the categories of "Very Good", "Good" and "Fair"). Additionally, categories of results are provided on pages 4-5: "Condition", "Gender", "Club", "Loft", "Lie Angle", "Hand:", "Flex", "Shaft Material", "Length", "Shaft Type", "Headcover", "Price".
65. Callaway doesn't disclose returning golf equipment if the equipment passes the verification.
66. Solheim, however, discloses authentication services that inspect merchandize prior to its being offered for sale and providing an authentication opinion. (P[0004]). It is obvious that the merchandise it provided to the authenticator (second entity) and returned to the first entity prior to its sale.
67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included authentication services where the merchandise is returned to the owner, as disclosed by Solheim, in the system of Callaway for the motivation of providing a new means of generating revenue for Callaway. By offering a Callaway authentication service for a fee,

Art Unit: 3629

Callaway would benefit from increased profits for a service that they are already equipped to perform and the customer would benefit by being able to offer his clubs for sale at a higher price as a result of the Callaway authentication. Solheim teaches that authentication services already exist, therefore, the combination with Callaway is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

68. Callaway/Solheim does not disclose providing a link that is accessible via a website to indicate the status of examination.
69. Knowles, however, discloses enabling a customer to track the progress of ordered equipment during various phases of manufacture using the manufacturer's website. (Fig. 3; E).
70. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included tracking the status, as disclosed by Knowles in the system disclosed by Solheim, for the motivation of providing a method of informing the customer about the progress of his item during the authentication process.
71. Callaway discloses reporting results via a web page (pg. 4-5) but does not disclose that a link to these results is provided from the second entity to the first entity.
72. Bernard, however, discloses a third party (i.e., second entity) verifying and certifying information regarding an applicant. The results are available via a URL such that the applicant (first entity) can provide the URL on his resume for an employer (third entity) to view the results via the Internet. (P[0031]).
73. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a URL to access results, as disclosed by Bernard, in the system of Callaway for the motivation of providing convenient means of transmitting results data. As Callaway already posts results on a web page, it is inherent that a URL exists for the web page and therefore the provision of a URL as a means to access the result data is an obvious expansion of Callaway.

74. Further, the combination with Callaway is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.
75. Callaway does not disclose the first entity using the registry engine code in a webpage.
76. Solheim, however, discloses that sellers cut and paste hyperlinks into a webpage displaying an item for auction. (P[0015]).
77. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a first entity cutting and pasting a URL into a webpage, as disclosed by Solheim, in the system of Callaway since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

Art Unit: 3629

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabrielle McCormick whose telephone number is (571)270-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (5:30 - 4:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629